UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

The Future of Pacifism

By RAYMOND B. BRAGG

Reflections on the Passing Time

By FRANK E. BAKER

The Chicago Anti-War Conference

By G. B. HALSTEAD

No More War

By WILFRED WELLOCK

VOLUME CX NUMBER 19

Chicago, January 23, 1933

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
LOUIS L. MANN, CURTIS W. REESE, *Associate Editors*

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
M. C. OTTO
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 291
The Future of Pacifism—RAYMOND B. BRAGG 293
Jottings—J. H. H 294

ARTICLES—
Reflections on the Passing Time—FRANK E. BAKER 295
The Chicago Anti-War Conference—G. B. HALSTEAD 296
No More War—WILFRED WELLOCK 298
The Free Church of America 299

POETRY—
The Over-Soul—*Edward Howard Griggs* 291
A Scene in War Time—MARGUERITE EMILIO 297
The City—ROSE J. LAMSON 297
The Prayer We Share—VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH 297

THE STUDY TABLE—
The World War and Germany's Collapse—TARAKNATH DAS .. 300
An Appeal for Reform—W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW 303
Peace Material for Adult Study—CURTIS W. REESE 303

THE FIELD—
An Appeal—Brookwood Labor College 290
The Prophets Speak—Declaration Central Conference American Rabbis 304

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

An Appeal

Announcement is made by Edouard C. Lindeman, author of several well-known works on labor education, of the formation of a committee of leading educators, labor officials, authors, editors, publicists and religious leaders, to sponsor the nation-wide financial campaign for Brookwood Labor College, Katonah, N. Y.

The members of the committee include: Dr. John Dewey; Prof. Paul H. Douglas, University of Chicago; Dr. John L. Elliott, Director Hudson Guild and leader Ethical Culture Society; Prof. George S. Counts, Columbia University; Prof. William Heard Kilpatrick, Teachers College; Prof. Broadus Mitchell, Johns Hopkins University; Prof. Henry R. Mussey, Wellesley College; Prof. John R. Commons, University of Wisconsin; Prof. Harry A. Overstreet, College of the City of New York; Dr. Everett Dean Martin, Peoples Institute; Prof. Leroy E. Bowman, Child Study Assn.; Prof. Paul F. Brissenden, Columbia University; Prof. Jesse H. Holmes, Swarthmore College; Dr. Abram L. Harris, Howard University; Miss Alice Hanson and Miss Eleanor Copenhaver, Industrial Department, Young Women's Christian Assn.; Miss Mary C. Barker, Atlanta, Ga.; Miss Selma Borchardt, Washington, D. C.; Prof. John A. Fitch, New York School of Social Work; Prof. Wm. M. Leiserson, Antioch College; Prof. Robert Morss Lovett, University of Chicago; Dr. Geo. S. Mitchell, Columbia University; Prof. E. A. Ross, University of Wisconsin; Prof. Alfred D. Sheffield, Wellesley College; Miss Hilda W. Smith, Director Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers in Industry; Prof. George A. Coe; Miss Lucile Kohn; Dr. E. C. Lindeman, New York School of Social Work.

James H. Maurer, former President, Pennsylvania Federation of Labor; David Dubinsky, president International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; A. J. Kennedy, president Amalgamated Lithographers Union; John P. Burke, President Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers; Dr. Henry R. Linville, president American Federation of Teachers; J. B. S. Hardman, editor official organ Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; Robert Fechner, Vice-President International Association of Machinists; Miss Fannia M. Cohn, Educational Department International Ladies Garment Workers Union; Abraham Lefkowitz, Vice-President American Federation of Teachers; Justus Ebert, editor official organ Amalgamated Lithographers Union; Powers Hapgood; Walter Ludwig, Director Pioneer Youth of America; Julius Hochman, Vice-President International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; Phil E. Ziegler, official editor *Brotherhood of Railway Clerks Journal;*

(*Continued on page* 303)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CX MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 1933 Number 19

THE OVER-SOUL

I am the eternal giver of love,
And I am the heart receiving;
I am the mother heart above,
And I am the child's soul breathing.

I am the truth the heart believes,
And I am the heart believing;
I am the exalted soul who sees,
And I am the source of seeing.

I am the unknown, knowing all,
And I am the essence known;
I am the love in the thrush's call,
And I am the sleep of the stone.

I am the doer of all good,
And I am the good that is done;
I am the spirit within the wood,
And I am the light of the sun.

I am the song the captive sings,
And I am the prisoner chained;
I am the one who contains all things,
And I am the all contained.

—*Edward Howard Griggs*

Now that the shock of Calvin Coolidge's death is over, there is opportunity to assess the significance and value of his career. It was in many ways a typical American career—so much so that we expect to see it pass into something of a legend. In origin it was the kind of career that belongs to the presidency in this country—a humble farm lad, born amid the Vermont hills, trained in the rural public schools, inured to labor and simple ways of life. In its unfolding this career had its dramatic moments, of which the most memorable was the taking of the oath of office, after the death of Harding, in the remote farm house, by the light of a kerosene lamp, at the midnight hour. It was all in the familiar folk-tradition of the American people, and constituted a central factor in the popularity which Mr. Coolidge easily won and continuously held. As to whether the progress of this career from Plymouth to Washington was a matter of luck or of personal ability will in all probability be long in dispute. Certainly chance played a tremendous role in the drama. It seemed as though Calvin Coolidge had only to wait, and the very stars in their courses swung his way. Even the hour of his retirement was a final gift of fortune. Yet it is doubtful if luck, if we call it such, is ever sustained over so long a period of time without help from the recipient of its favors. In Coolidge's case there were factors of perseverance, firm integrity, and a certain tried ability which are not to be underestimated. In character, the late President was an almost uncanny combination, for better or worse, of the essential qualities of Yankee genius. He was of course little of a leader, least of all a statesman. He loomed large for a while because his head was reared in a landscape of petty foothills. If he lacked warmth, compassion, generosity, wide sympathy, lofty vision, it was because his racial blood had long since been running a cold and sluggish stream. But there was a stubborn strength in the man. He was simple and unspoiled in an age of extravagance. He had a shrewdness which was better than the wisdom of many other men. He had patience, poise, self-control, and an elemental honesty. Calvin Coolidge was neither great nor heroic, but he had his points.

It is a favorite argument of cynics that the Japanese, by their wanton depredations in Manchuria, have destroyed the Briand-Kellogg Pact. But is this the real outcome of the Asiatic tragedy? Have the Japanese made "a scrap of paper" of this great document, or have they transformed it into a scroll of judgment upon themselves and their inglorious war? If there were no Pact, there would be no case against Japan. Her operations in Manchuria constitute only what was uniformly the way of the world prior to the solemn declaration of Paris. If war had not been outlawed, then this war north and now south of the Great Wall would be as lawful as any other armed imperialistic adventure. But when Japan joined the other nations in signing the Briand-Kellogg Treaty, she laid down a rule of life for herself and for mankind; and this it is which now condemns her. For the first time in the history of modern imperialism, a government is under bonds to the law and conscience of the race, and stands therefore convicted by her own action as a criminal. This does not stop the fighting, nor restore life to those killed in battle. War is going on in spite of outlawry. But it is going on *under conviction of guilt!* This is a new thing in the history of the world, and perhaps the first step toward the final goal of peace. We look upon this situation in Asia as not dissimilar to the Civil War in the history of America. This country was founded under the authority of a constitution which guaranteed to the states "a more perfect union."

This union was shattered by the Great Rebellion; and it might well have been said—as we believe it *was* said! —that the conflict destroyed the national Constitution. But this Constitution was never so much alive as when by its mere existence it made the Civil War a rebellion outside the law, and its perpetrators *traitors*. This was the vindication, not the destruction, of the Constitution, and the establishment of final peace. So with the Pact of Paris at this moment! It stands as judgment on the present and prophecy for the future.

Technocracy may or may not be the solution of our ills. We do not know. We have seen no statement of the new doctrine which convinced us of its adequacy or even told us clearly what it is all about. We are suspending judgment pending further and better information. Meanwhile we want to say that, whether sound or unsound, technocracy we take to be one of the overwhelmingly significant signs of the times. Why all this interest all of a sudden in what seems to be a highly abstruse theory of economic change presented in technical language by a group of professional engineers and scholars? The people of the country have known no such fad since Mah Jong or Midget Golf. Is this a thing to laugh at, or is it a profoundly serious phenomena? To us this sudden flare-up of interest in technocracy, instead of in a game or a fashion or a sport, means that the American people are at last getting serious. They are beginning to understand certain things with an almost terrible clearness. First, they are involved in a situation of economic and social collapse not only more menacing than any previous panic or depression, but of a different and altogether momentous character. Secondly, every endeavor to restore society to something resembling normal conditions has failed; traditional remedies and experimental policies have alike proved futile. Thirdly, we must escape from the present impasse, or else surrender our social order to sudden catastrophe or to slow but sure disintegration. All of which means that we realize our plight, and are eager to do something about it! It is this fact which makes the people grasp at technocracy, which seems at least to be thoroughgoing, as desperately as a drowning swimmer grasps at a floating spar. No matter what it is, it may keep us afloat, and at last carry us to safety! Such unanimity and intensity of interest in a panacea means a vast change in the public mind. It is a preparation for enormous events. It is the first step toward revolution.

It is amazing, especially in times like these, that the year 1932 went by with scarcely a mention of the fact that it marked the one hundredth anniversary of the passage of the great Reform Bill in England. It is well to ponder that momentous event. Political conditions, following upon the Napoleonic wars, had become intolerable in Great Britain. A popular agitation for reform, sustained for nearly two decades, threatened the realm with the violent upheaval of revolution. For the people were demanding a surrender of political power which the privileged possessors of this power were refusing to recognize. At the last moment, when sword and torch were about to be raised, the landowners and the peers gave way, and there was consummated without bloodshed the greatest political change in England since the days of the Stuarts. Why is this not a pattern for our own day and generation? Economic conditions, following upon the Great War, have become intolerable. Why should this not lead to a popular demand for change comparable to that conducted for years in England by Place, Cobbett and Brougham? The issue is the same—the surrender of power by those who have to those who have not. And just because of this fact there are those who argue that the transfer can never be achieved except through violence. But the agitation, the demand, is the essential thing; and cannot we then trust the social genius of our people to make peaceably the same adjustment in the economic field that was made peaceably a hundred years ago in the political field? What we know is that the same type of revolution must be accomplished today that was accomplished yesterday. And we see no reason why it should not be accomplished in the same way.

This radio business is getting serious! For a long time the effect of broadcasting an entertainment, or a game, or a church service has been questionable from the standpoint of the interest thus placed upon the air. Why should people attend an entertainment or game, when they can sit comfortably at home and enjoy it all without trouble, or inconvenience, or even expense of any kind? Why should a man get up on Sunday morning and go to church when he can hear the sermon in his bedroom, and avoid the contribution box altogether? Few churches are now broadcasting their services; football managers and baseball magnates are rapidly coming to the conclusion that they must get off the air. But the radio is now becoming something more serious than a competitor with itself. Thus, during the recent political campaign, Mr. Hoover hired a certain Tuesday evening for the broadcasting of his speech, and thus shut off the Texaco Fire Chief, Ed Wynn. The *Nation* spoke not only jokingly but seriously of the thousands of votes that the Republican candidate may have lost by this procedure. On a recent lecture trip we were told that a certain meeting would begin somewhat late, "in order to escape conflict with Eddie Cantor." The nights when Jack Pearl presents Baron Munchausen are regarded as undesirable for any other activity. All of which suggests that if the radio succeeds in hiring or developing first-class entertainment ability, other competing undertakings, such as concerts, lectures, and

public meetings, will be placed at an increasingly serious disadvantage! The radio, in other words, may well be destined to work enormous changes in our contemporary life. Already Bruce Barton has prophesied the disappearance of the church in favor of a radio temple. The theatre may be displaced by the broadcasting studio. Great meetings, sports, and concerts may be organized for radio purposes only. It's all very new and strange, and somewhat horrifying.

Are the days of big sport over? The Olympics this last summer were a tremendous affair so far as preparations and publicity were concerned, but it is notorious that crowds and gate receipts were not up to expectations. Baseball is having hard sledding. Many minor leagues have gone into bankruptcy, or else are being kept alive by subsidies from the magnates on the major circuits. But even these big leagues are suffering deflation. Most of the teams, including such traditional money-makers as the New York "Giants" and the Brooklyn "Robins" and the Philadelphia "Athletics," went into the "red," and for the first time the loudly-tooted World Series played to large areas of empty seats. But the biggest "flop" was the college football season recently closed. The slump here began last season when attendance dropped off tens of thousands from the year before at all the great stadia, and the Yale-Princeton classic only half filled the Yale Bowl. This season was even worse, with large batches of tickets hawked about to the general public at any price they would bring. The facts of the football situation are admirably summarized in an amusing and wise article in the December *Atlantic Monthly* by the well-known sports writer, John R. Tunis. This expert thinks that ten years may see the end of the orgy, and speculates as to what "they will be using the stadiums for in the year 1957." Of course, the depression is a prime cause of this collapse of sport, especially as the managers, with incredible arrogance and stupidity, have refused to reduce prices. Witness the madness of the World Series management in refusing to sell reserved seats for anything less than a block of three games! But there may be a more serious force at work. Mr. Tunis surmises that "America is coming of age"—that the adolescent period of our national existence, which revels in noise, bally-hoo, and vulgar excitement of any kind, is going by, and maturity at last beginning. It may be so. We do not pretend to know. But this we feel—that anything which will deliver the American people from the sport circuses of the last decade is healthy.

The Future of Pacifism

Since the Commission on Social Trends made its 1600 page report a few weeks ago the radical has taken on a new status of dignity. The ordinarily restrained academician toyed with the possibility of violent social upheaval in the findings presented to President Hoover, the sponsor of the enterprise. The high priest of rugged individualism may not revise his cherished beliefs but a few of his followers may comment on the irony of his position. For it seems that the men of his own choice could find few trends to liven his pet dogma. Had the investigation carried over into the more illicit tendencies in modern social institutions the results might have been more spectacular and disconcerting. Had the commission examined the trend of pacifism (it may have done without making public in early reports its result) we are convinced that it would have brought no peace either to pacifist or militarist. No radical movement is free from outside forces but pacifism is changing under the current stress at a rate so rapid that predictions about its future are imperative.

In the years prior to the depression the problems of pacifism revolved around a political pole. Those who announced themselves as unalterably opposed to war thought in terms of international-imperialist struggle. Young men and women driven into the ranks of war resisters by religious conviction looked upon their decision as the supreme demonstration of their religious worth. To be sure there were vestiges of poverty, industry was monarchical in its organization, exploitation of personality was not entirely blotted from the planet. But if war could be driven from the world these other perversions would yield to time. Somehow it was war—this hideous culmination of all the evils known to the race that bothered and postponed the coming of another day. We recall a group of theological students who gathered in solemn conclave to proclaim their refusal to support any war "regardless of its real or ostensible purpose." The step was taken after the failure in Geneva in 1927. It was a matter of religious import but like so many things religious it was lacking in reality. Today we look upon it as an expression of radical sentiment in the years behind 1929, years in which we talked of emerging economic factors without a moment of consideration as to what they might be. After all prosperity was at hand; we were assured that the poorhouse had no place in the future.

Today the pacifist is considering his problems from entirely different angles. The question of international war, important as it is, is only one of many. No longer does he talk glibly about the gradual evolution of society after war is taken out of human behavior patterns. Recognized as part of the economic political complex and inseparable from it, the real meaning of

armed struggle is identified. Assuming the kind of world economic organization we have, assumes also the institution of war. Cooperation is inconceivable in a competitive world. The war of all against all has been the daily life of the western world for two centuries. To uproot any phase of the system while leaving any other phase intact is beyond possibility. The pacifist then must identify himself with the broader struggle to remould the very basis of current society. And when he sets about his task the logical ground for his earlier attitude trembles beneath his feet.

Those who have sought a reordering of society have never been treated gently. One need not accept Marx in all his ramifications to recognize the ends to which the strong will go in defending their cherished privileges, which have come to be considered as rights. Revolutions have often taken to the peaceful course and remained there until fundamental change had taken place. Violence in the revolutionary process has invariably occurred because conservatives have refused to recognize the reality of a change already taken place. It is conceivable that a consistent pacifism would excuse itself from the exercise of force in any given instance and by so doing permit a reversion to conditions that it had long toiled to overcome. To throw oneself into the path of bullets may be a personal sacrifice worthy of song but the test of such a gesture must be made in terms of social outcome. In short, the contemporary pacifist cannot think in terms of even the immediate past. The immediate future with all its dire possibilities requires an orientation unique in time. And religious sentiment is a poor ground on which to make all decisions. No examples of the ages quite suffice in the face of the world crises.

Religious America (in so far as religion has become conscious of social problems) has found in Gandhi the beacon of a new method in social relations. We share that enthusiasm. But India is not the West. The setting which gives validity to the method of Gandhi is apart from our own. Practically, in that setting, there is reason to believe that the threat of violence is the thing most feared by the British over-lords. How long can these masses be kept within the program set for them? And if they are firm in their faith are they ethically superior to the Russian revolutionists who took to their arms when the success of the Revolution was challenged by foreign armies and reactionary natives? There is still an idea that the non-resistant represents the spirit while the man girded for battle is of the flesh. It is like the glow that surrounded philosophical idealism in more innocent times. Force cannot yet be relegated to the realm of worthless things. This lesson has been taught by those who have so effectively used their weapons in the service of exploitation.

What may be the future of pacifism? The course seems clear. Germany following the armistice was a pacific nation. The nature of our economic-political life has brought back her militancy. And so will the pacifists of America reclaim the method if not the goals that they abandoned to take up the torch of the new life. Reinhold Niebuhr is only one of the first to make his way into the waiting future. Others will follow. It may be hoped that the world will yield to the insistence of the radical generation before the chaos of violence is loosed. Perhaps another great war will burst upon us to add proof to the futility of that means of settling human differences. If this latter alternative should come to pass what then? A pacifist could stand at his post refusing to desert as some refused in 1917-1918. Or he could abandon all that he has thought he cherished to ruin the fighting machine from within its workings. Where will he be of greatest service? We do not pretend to answer but at this point will the issue of pacifism be decided in the coming years.

RAYMOND B. BRAGG.

Jottings

The United States today has no living ex-president. The gap will be filled on the 4th of March. But, meanwhile, will some historian tell us if this ever happened before.

Where is Lloyd-George? What has become of Bruening? Will somebody page Laval? And is Lowden living or dead? Verily, the great and famous pass quickly. If obscurity like this can happen in a lifetime, what will happen after death?

Careful study of the many statements at the opening of 1933 that the worst of the depression is over reveals that the basis of prophecy is the fact that there has to be an end to everything. On this basis we do not see why it is not just as logical to argue that it is our civilization and not the depression which is ending.

An American Negro, Robert Robinson, who has given inventions and plans to the factory in which he works in Moscow, has been honored among Russia's "heroes of labor," and had his portrait hung in a place where formerly hung the pictures of royalty. Who says this is not like a dream come true?

The proudest civilization man has ever builded is returning to barter as the only means of keeping things

going. Thus does history swing full circle. We return to where our ancestors began.

If beer is intoxicating, it is obviously unconstitutional, and will be so declared by the Supreme Court.

If beer is non-intoxicating and therefore constitutional, why must it be kept out of the "dry" states?

J. H. H.

Reflections on the Passing Time

This is being written on New Year's day, 1933. Two questions persistently thrust themselves upon me; first, is any time important? Second, is this time, the now, more important than another time, or than any other time?

Of course, time is important. Neither I, nor the room in which I sit, can exist apart from time. I can not exist in space only. If it were not for time, I could not exist at all. Time is the fourth dimension.

Whether today is more important than another day or any other day—whether the now is more important than another now—depends entirely on man. It is relative to man and his thinking. Today will be more important than any other day of the year if man thinks more today than on any other day of the year. The question, whether he thinks more on the first day of the year than on any other can, I think, be answered affirmatively. New Year's day, in spite of its absurdities, in spite of its silly social customs (which, by the way, are not nearly so silly as were those of half a century ago), in spite of its bibulous celebrations, in spite of its commercialized sports, is a day of serious thinking for millions of people.

Even the New Year resolutions, the jests of the cynic to the contrary, are not wholly silly. In so far as they become a guide for future conduct, they have great value, and many New Year resolutions do function in that way.

But more important than resolutions is the stock taking, the inventorying of one's spiritual and moral possessions, that often precedes the making of resolutions. And this stock taking is very valuable, both to the individual and to society as a whole.

It is a pity that this idea of making a New Year's inventory as a basis for a prognosis of the future should be confined to the field of material things. And yet to a very large extent it is. The pages of the New Year's editions are devoted almost entirely to forecasts of material progress. There is always an article by some great banker on the financial outlook. There is sure to be one by a great utility magnate on the probable production and consumption of gas or electricity as the case may be. And there is just as sure to be a forecast by a railroad president of the probable change in the curve of revenue freight loadings. And so on through the whole world of material things.

But I look in vain for a forecast of religious progress; I can find no chart of our moral thinking; to be sure there is likely to be a prophecy of probable scientific discoveries, but these deal largely with those inventions that ring the cash register; but never yet have I seen an inventory of our artistic and musical possessions as a basis for a prognosis of possible achievements in these fields.

I should like to see a New Year's edition of the New York *Times* or the Baltimore *Sun* or the St. Louis *Post Dispatch,* or the Milwaukee *Journal* devoted to an inventory of the intangibles—the imperishables of life, as a basis for a prognosis of their probable production during the year. And let it be remarked and put down here and now that there need be no fear of an over-production in any of them during the year 1933, or in any year to come.

Whether this particular first day of the year will be the most important in history is again entirely dependent on man's thinking. It will be the most important only if man does more and better thinking on this day than he has ever done on a New Year's day in the past or ever will do on a New Year's day in the future.

Whether he has better capacity for thinking today than he has ever had in the past is extremely doubtful. That there are more minds to think than there have ever been before is certain. That they should be better trained for thinking is just as evident. Certainly man has better tools of thinking than ever before. Whether his individual power of thinking or whether his power of collective thinking is greater than ever before is extremely doubtful.

But as to the need for thinking today there can be no question. Psychologists tell us that all thinking begins in a cross road situation, in a problem to be solved. That man has more problems to be solved today than on any other day in his history is beyond the cavil of a doubt. That he is more generally conscious of his problems than ever before may be open to question. But I think that may be granted.

If man raises himself from this depression, and the whole civilized world is in it, he will have to do it by his power of organized thinking. Whether he has the necessary capacity may be open to question; but there are some very encouraging signs. For one thing, he seems to recognize clearly that the problem is his. He does not blame his present condition upon the gods nor does he look to them or to magic to get him out. He seems to recognize clearly that the problem, both in its making and in its cure, is his. That is a very great gain.

And so this first day of the year 1933 may turn out to be the most important day in the history of man. That it may is my fervent and legitimate wish.

FRANK E. BAKER.*

*President, State Teachers College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

That you cannot serve God and Mammon is an economic truth of the highest value. We have to make our choice. Western nations are today groaning under the heel of the god of materialism. Their moral growth has been stunted. They measure their progress in pounds, shillings and pence. America's wealth has become the standard. She is the envy of the other nations. I have heard many of our countrymen say that we will gain American wealth but avoid its methods. I venture to suggest that such an attempt, if it were made, is foredoomed to failure.

Gandhi.

The Chicago Anti-War Conference

Attention! All eyes on Chicago! Something far more significant and important than preparations for the 1933 World's Fair has just taken place in that Cermak-Capone riddled city. Under the banner, "Fight War," six hundred and eighty students, representing over a hundred colleges and universities, twenty-nine states of the Union, five countries and numerous, widely differing types of socio-political parties and views, including the Communists (who were in a vast majority), Socialists and neo-Capitalists, rallied in a grim, almost fierce, struggle to muster a "united front" against the rapidly approaching specter of another world war. With amazing realism, remarkable political maturity and burning passion, if not thorough sincerity, this Conference literally and actually fought for a program to help attain world peace.

Two fundamental issues vitally connected with progressive peace-thinking were made startingly clear at the Conference. Formerly, although peace gatherings have wrangled and debated over the causes of war, most of them could unite on the common assumption that war and violence are wrong. But not so in this remarkable gathering. In fact, almost the reverse was true. There was considerable unanimity that in the roots of capitalism lie embedded the seeds of conflict and war, and accordingly the eradication of war from the world is inextricably bound up with the abolition of the capitalistic system. But there was nowhere near unanimity on the wrongness or crime of war. It was only certain types of wars, principally imperialistic, that came under the hammer. Wars which might bring justice and freedom to the world's oppressed were frankly justified and defended. In other words, the Conference generally was not so anti-war as anti-capitalistic and anti-imperialistic. It was singularly significant, I thought, that in a peace conference, men and women students could not agree on the wrongness of war, but could agree on bigger and better uses for it than in the past.

A great peace banner stretched across the front of the first balcony announced in bold letters, "Fight Imperialist Wars." And Jane Addams, that noble healer of a sick humanity, when she addressed the Conference, pointing out the banner, said that the delegates must go beyond this statement and fight all wars. But on the vast sea of faces that looked up at her there were very few that reflected the responsive, sympathetic light of discipleship of her philosophy of life.

Interestingly enough there was a small but firm minority, principally composed of Socialist-pacifists, who were committed to a belief in a modified American form of the Gandhi non-violent technique of mass moral coercion and resistance. This group representing the left wing of the old pacifist non-resistance movement, and now known under the anachronistic label of "militant pacifism," set their faces stolidly against war of any kind or for any ends, no matter how noble those ends might be. As I listened to the heated debates over the issue of violence vs. non-violence, very often I thought of what a momentous tribute this was to the influence of Gandhi and the Indian movement. If these issues have thrown confusion into the ranks of the old pacifist movement by demanding imperatively that they think through their position anew, Gandhi and India have also saved the pacifists from disgraceful annihilation, if they will be saved. Gandhi's program of a mass non-violent moral coercion and resistance has given the old, dying, ineffective pacifism—the passive neutrality which cowardly acquiesced in social and economic injustice and immorality—a constructive, effective, fighting plan of action. One may rightly become concerned at the spectacle of an increasing number of radicals endorsing certain types of wars, as happened at the Chicago Conference, for instance. But let us take what strength we may from the new hope infused into our war-torn world by the Gandhi movement and method. If this Conference had one supreme meaning, and it might well be a warning also, it was that the peace forces of America, while they still have a chance, must develop and set in motion a modified form of mass non-violent moral coercion and resistance against the war system and for the removal of the causes of war. If there ever was a supreme need for a Messiah suddenly to appear in the midst of our bewildered pacifist ranks, it is now! And, tragically enough, it seems perfectly obvious to many of us that Gandhi is such a one, and non-violent mass action his Gospel of salvation. Yet the majority see or hear him not. Dare we delay longer in receiving him and enacting his Gospel?

It may be clear to some from what I have already said that the Communists have, in this matter of war, some very strange bed-fellows. As one reflects on their attitudes concerning war and listens to the speeches delivered by their leaders, he is amazed to discover that the Communists, even in a peace conference, think and talk extraordinarily like the oft-quoted militarists and one hundred per centers. Members of the latter groups, while voicing their theoretical opposition to war, have continually justified certain kinds of wars for certain noble ends, using their own ideas of nobility. And so with the Communists! About the only difference between them and the capitalist militarists, and I admit it is a very great one, is a difference in the content of the term, "noble ends." Members of both schools of thought are quite capable of fighting their "holy wars," and, as one delegate cleverly said, "The holiest of all holy wars yet remains to be fought—the war in the defense of the Soviet Union against the capitalist-imperialist countries."

Strangely enough, the Conference clearly showed that the Communists again have the reactionaries and conservatives as their unwitting bed-fellows on the basis of a common dislike for Gandhi and his technique. But their reasons for the dislike of Gandhi were, obviously, quite different. Whereas the Communists regard Gandhi as a gigantic modern reincarnation of Judas Iscariot, who has betrayed not only one man into the hands of the imperialists but millions, the reactionaries get all in a huff about this "naked fakir" who is against all "law, order, civilization, and religion." The Communists definitely part company, however, with the reactionaries when they, the former, pour red-hot coals of condemnation on the head of poor Gandhi for accepting funds from the coffers of India's capitalists. And they have the naivety to do this even when meeting amid the pure Gothic cloisters of the millionaire-endowed University of Chicago.

There was one aspect of the Conference that specially interested me. It was the utter frankness and

thoroughness with which most delegates favored heaving age-old moral considerations overboard. A fitting illustration of this point can be found in the attitude adopted by the Conference on the policy of "boring from within" for the explicit purpose of demoralizing and crushing organizations. One of the leaders of the Conference openly urged the delegates to join the campus R. O T. C. with the avowed intention of destroying it from within. The same leader moved a resolution from the floor of the Conference to the same effect, and it was overwhelmingly carried. In the midst of the discussion on this subject I interjected the ethical and moral implications of such a policy and pointed out briefly that it involved compromises with good faith and conscience which might, if carried to their logical conclusions, do as much harm to society as the R. O. T. C. I suggested that the delegates find other means of removing the R. O. T. C. from the campuses that were more honorable and above board. The interjection of this theme threw the Conference into an uproar. Delegate after delegate clamored for the floor. Most of them bitterly condemned such a viewpoint. As one delegate said, almost in a rage, and he seemed to voice the sentiments of the majority, "Pretty soon this conference will degenerate into a discussion of ethics, and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that any delegate who raises the view of ethics in this discussion be ruled out of order."

As I sat, pondering over this phenomenon, I thought over and over, "What will this all lead to? Are economic justice, freedom and equality the only ideals and values by which men live? Are there not values deeper and still more fundamental upon which men and societies build truly and permanently?" Truth, beauty, goodness, love, service, non-violence, these and others seemed almost non-essential to most of the delegates. An increasing number of radical students, such as those who assembled at Chicago, seem to fail utterly to realize the essential wholeness and unity of life. They do not grasp the truism that men cannot destroy or discard certain fundamental values without thereby impairing and injuring, to a degree, all of them. For instance, and it is an issue on which I feel strongly, a society established by violence, no matter how equal and just it may be, will and must suffer because of the original sacrifice of the basic values of non-violence and love. These are considerations, although crudely and briefly stated, that the Communist and radical youth in America would do well to ponder. Ethics and morality are not so bourgeoise that they must be scrapped in the struggle for a Socialist society.

Some persons, on reading this article, may be tempted to judge the Conference hastily and condemn it. There is not and cannot be room, I believe, for unfair judgment and bitter condemnation. We must recognize, with all the sheer realism of these students in the realm of politics and economics, that this section of our youth but accurately reflects the weaknesses and failures of our educational and religious institutions. Here then is ground for sincere repentance that we have not done our job well; and sufficient cause, if there ever could be, for a renewed and more consecrated effort to build character that will stand the birth-pangs of a new society and will be worthy of the high idealism that first conceived it.

G. B. Halstead.

A Scene in War Time

Majestic in their snow-clad purity,
They seem aloof from human strife and sin—
Those Alps—which hem the peaceful valleys in,
And give a sense of snug security.

Yet close were they to strife when countless tracks
Of rough-shod feet defaced their spotless snow.
As slowly upward from the vales below
Trudged files of men with bent and loaded backs.

Like beasts of burden harnessed to a plow,
With straining muscles, furrowing hard soil,
These men were harnessed to the abject toil
Of dragging cannon o'er the Alps' pure brow!

The strength of beasts, but more than brutish skill
Was needed for the pull up steep and crag;
The human mind and hand alone could drag
These weapons fashioned for the human kill.

What degradation of the human soul:
Men, beasts of burden, and then beasts of prey!
Helpless, and goaded by the ruthless sway
Of war, which has not life, but death, for goal.

Marguerite Emilio.

The City

Dread city of endless narrow streets
That stretch away through every busy mart.
You've bruised unnumbered weary feet
And crushed the hope of many a trusting heart.

You boast tall spires, like pointed knives
They seem to pierce the heavens through.
How many men laid down their lives
To build those monuments for you?

You boast no flowers, in gardens fair,
Where happy children romp and play.
In tenements they gasp for air,
And grow more wan from day to day.

Oh God! that some should be so poor
They have nowhere to lay their head,
And some from every want secure,
Upon the choicest viands fed.

A righteous God could never plan,
That some crawl eons through the mud,
While others, called "the sons of man,"
Like leeches, fatten on their blood.

Lord help us stamp out lust and greed,
Run rampant since the world began.
Then will we be thy sons indeed,
A perfect brotherhood of man.

Rose J. Lamson.

The Prayer We Share

With all my heart I worship Thee
In whom I dwell, who dwells in me,
Whose beauty in all things I see.

I make Thee—God—my very own,
And nevermore shall walk alone,
My every fear forever flown.

I claim in love Thy wisdom mine
And have no thought that is not Thine;
So am I filled with power divine.

Strengthened, O Lord, by love of Thee
To every creature would I be
As faithful as Thou art to me!

Victor E. Southworth.

No More War*

It is probable that history will describe the few years which commenced with 1931 as a great turning point in world affairs. Those years may indeed mark the end of a civilization. The economic collapse which asserted itself last year with such terrifying certainty and with such universal impartiality, struck a mortal blow at a system of society which by large sections of the community had come to be regarded as part of the order of the universe. The supporters and beneficiaries of that system have not yet recovered from the shock of the collapse, and, still bewildered, are looking for a sign. But no sign appears save that which appeared to Belshazzar.

Part and parcel of that social order is a war system which is paralyzing civilization, yet which the fear of economic collapse, among other things, prevents the Governments from scrapping. The upkeep of that war system is involving the armed nations of the world in an annual expenditure of some £900,000,000, which is regarded as a first charge upon the resources of the nations concerned, and to raise which health, housing, education, the physique and even the dignity and self-respect of millions of unemployed workers are sacrificed.

So after fourteen years we have to face the cold, bleak fact that armaments are more powerful than ever; that the account which the people rendered in blood and tears during the most hellish four years in history has not yet been settled, and that the war system is more firmly entrenched and a greater menace to mankind today than before that costly carnage.

I have listened with amazement, as I am certain you have done also, to the oft-repeated statement that a halt must be called to the policy of disarmament by example. It is time this assertion was challenged and the bluff called. The simple fact is that so far there has been no disarmament by any nation. The drop in our own military expenditure during the last few years has not been anything like commensurate with the fall in prices during the same period. But that is not all. How has the money been spent? Increasingly on machinery. In modern warfare, as in modern industry, men count for less and less and machinery for more and more. What imagination can describe the destructive power of the most up-to-date instruments of war? Think what the next war will be like with mechanical infantries and mechanized cavalries, with monster tank and armored car corps, with more powerful submarines, the new seaplane units, and all the concealed terrors of modern air forces.

It is not too much to say that the fighting and destructive power of the armed forces of the nations is several times greater today than it was even ten years ago, and incalculably greater than in 1914. To realize the growth in the killing power of armaments consider the following figures: In the Boer War the number killed was 9,800, in the Franco-German War it was 184,000, and in the Russo-Japanese War 160,000; but in the Great War it reached the colossal figure of 10,000,000. Advancing at the same rate, and preparations warrant the assumption, the killed in the next holocaust, if such there be, will be reckoned by the hundred million, whence the earth will be swept pretty clean of a race which had not the sanity to prize and organize the abundance which its genius had assured so as to enjoy the peace, the leisure and the fellowship which lay within its grasp.

Why do the people tolerate this failure of the Governments to do what the whole world wants to see done? It is because they are bewildered and do not perceive the contradictions within the existing social system which make disarmament impossible. The failure of the Geneva Conference may cause them to see the contradiction between imperialism and disarmament. How, for example, can Great Britain disarm while yet retaining her hold upon India by means of the sword for the purpose of financial exploitation? When British statesmen say it is not possible to cut down the number of their ships, they are thinking of India and the conveyance of troops and munitions to that country to meet the demands of Imperialism in a crisis. But if Britain is not willing to reduce the size of her navy, France and Italy will not consent to a reduction of their land forces. Hence there will be no disarmament to speak of.

But there are other contradictions. So long as the economic life of the nations is permitted to rest upon the rights of private greed, so long will there be a relationship of war between an interest-drawing class and a working or wage-drawing class. And the threat of class war or revolution is at this moment a powerful deterrent of disarmament.

In view of the growing fear complex, so apparent at present, how can Governments which support the conditions which give rise to that fear disarm? Indeed, fear, springing from merciless economic rivalry, from the threat of revolution, from the growing influence of Russia upon world thought and action, and from the least attempt to weaken the military power of Imperialism, will prevent any appreciable measure of disarmament at Geneva.

These facts are not generally realized, but by and by the skeletons will come out of the cupboard.

The present impasse proves that there can be no half-way course between complete disarmament and being armed to the teeth. It is a question of all or nothing. The menace of the air will remain until the Powers prove their belief in peace by abandoning once and for all the war system and scrapping all their armaments. Such is the destructive power of modern armaments, that so long as the war system remains nations will secretly, if not openly, develop and even concentrate on the most powerful weapons. In war which involves extermination, there can be no kid-glove rules, and no promise worth the paper it is written on that vital and decisive weapons will not be used when necessity demands.

What, in these circumstances, are pacifists to do? Obviously a new orientation of policy is called for. If democracy is to be defied and the will of the people ignored, those who see the danger which threatens must organize to prevent that final catastrophe which the Governments, by their want of courage, are inviting.

The older politicians, with their nineteenth century ideology, have failed and must be swept aside. Their minds are embedded in a complex of militarism and Imperialism from which they are unable to escape. If they are left in charge of affairs much longer they will unquestionably plunge the nations into another

*Chairman's address at the "No More War Conference" held at Sheffield, England.

war, notwithstanding that they have no intention of doing that. The simple fact is that their mentality prevents their escaping from the vicious circle which at present paralyzes all their better intentions. But it will take time to get them replaced, and the situation is serious. Moreover, in the crises which threaten we cannot place our trust in democracy, for evidence is not lacking that even now democracy may be played out.

Look over a map of the world and you will be startled to discover that more than two-thirds of the world's population is at present in a state of revolution or living under some form of Dictatorship. Whereas but a few years ago it seemed as if the whole world would adopt the Parliamentary system of Government, belief in that system is fast breaking down, while country after country is abandoning it. The British General Election of last year struck a more deadly blow at Parliamentary Government than is generally realized, and if fear is again used to determine voting as it was then, faith in the existing system of government will be severely shaken and largely shattered even in this country. The floating vote in a democratically governed country is sufficiently large to enable a well-organized policy of panic-mongering to win every time, given a press with a circulation running into millions and the B. B. C. working in conjunction.

Consequently, until the time arrives when affairs are controlled by younger and more enlightened men, I am driven to the conclusion that if war is to be averted independent action must be taken and definite organization carried out. The following are what appear to me to be the necessary steps to be taken in present circumstances:

1. We must mobilize an army of people who are ready to declare that they will take no part in any future war, and it must be made known to the authorities that such an army exists.

2. We must organize to prevent another war should war be threatened or declared. This might involve the organization of a General Strike.

3. These things are not enough, however. Realizing the causes of war we must zealously work to establish a social system based on co-operation for the common good, and seek to remove social injustice and the causes of class and international war.

4. Also, realizing the growing tendency to abandon democratic government and to adopt revolutionary or dictatorial methods, in the interest of peace and justice it becomes imperative to work out a pacifist alternative to violent revolution.

It is to these considerations that we are asking this Conference to devote its earnest attention.*

WILFRED WELLOCK.

*This policy, recommended by the Chairman, was adopted by the Conference in formal resolutions.—Editor.

The Free Church of America

The report of the Unitarian and Universalist Commissions stating definite plans and purposes of the "Free Church of America" is being released today (January 12, 1933). This enterprise is one of the most forward-looking and promising of recent developments in the field of federation of religious efforts.

The preamble of the plan reads:

> We, representatives of churches of the free spirit, unite ourselves in the fellowship of the Free Church of America. We affirm our faith that unity of purpose is the bond of highest religious fellowship. We seek closer cooperation with others of like purpose, recognizing that, in accordance with congregational polity, the members of this fellowship have entire freedom in matters of religious belief and statements of faith, and holding that, if we are controlled by a purpose to serve mankind in a spirit of mutual good will, differing statements of faith may enrich our common life.

The essentials of the preamble are the bond of fellowship, unity of purpose, and the spirit of service; and the statement that differences in theological definition can enrich the common life. Dr. J. A. C. Fagginger Auer, professor of church history in the Theological School in Harvard University, and in the Crane Theological School of Tufts College, says:

> To the best of my recollection this is the first time that such a preamble has been accepted by two well-organized church bodies.

The Commissions propose that the administration of the "Free Church" shall be vested in a Council representing all the constituent bodies with officers elected from the Council and with such committees and commissions as may be necessary.

The expenses of the Council will be met by appropriations made by the constituent bodies, and by contributions of organizations and individuals.

According to the plan, the Free Church would become an all-inclusive fellowship of religious liberals. Local churches would retain their present name, adding "Free Church of America." Each affiliated denomination would retain, for the present at least, its ecclesiastical name, and its funds. So far as possible, however, duplication would be avoided, and greater efficiency promoted in the use of men and material.

The plan emphasizes the fact that "local consolidations are not the objective of the Free Church movement." More loyalty, more effort, more churches and stronger resources are wanted.

The Commissions voted that the following enterprises might well be carried on in common: Church extension; religious education; women's work; laymen's work; young people's work; social relations activities; missionary literature; preaching missions; radio broadcasting; religious publications; publishing houses; hymnology; joint summer meetings and institutes; local headquarters; common use of properties and equipments; regional representatives to work in both fellowships; regional conferences and associations; religious work in foreign lands; increasing cooperation with the "International Association for Liberal Christianity and Religious Freedom," formerly known as "The International Congress," in which both Universalists and Unitarians have long cooperated; other enterprises to be suggested later.

The following cooperative undertakings already are in force:

The directors of the American Unitarian Association and of the Universalist General Convention have approved the merger of the Wayside Pulpit (Unitarian) and the Community Pulpit (Universalist) to become

effective this month as "The Wayside Community Pulpit." When the Free Church is organized, the Wayside Community Pulpit will be issued by that body.

The Commissions representing both fellowships are working to prepare a common hymnal. When the plan of the Free Church is adopted the book will be issued as the Hymnal of the Free Church of America.

The Unitarian Department of Social Relations under Dr. Robert C. Dexter, and the Universalist Welfare Committee under Rev. Charles H. Pennoyer, are cooperating with the American Friends Service Committee under Clarence E. Pickett.

The Religious Education Departments are cooperating in the use of church school material, field work, community schools and summer institutes.

A joint committee representing the trustees of *The Christian Leader* and the trustees of *The Christian Register* are studying the possibilities of cooperation. A similar study is being made of possible cooperation between the two publishing houses.

A first notable result has been the offer by the American Unitarian Association to the Universalist General Convention of the use of the annex building, 16 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass. The Universalist General Convention has this offer under consideration.

This completed plan will be submitted for approval to the annual meeting of the American Unitarian Association in May, 1933, and to the Biennial session of the Universalist General Convention in October of the same year.

The fact should be emphasized that the plan has aroused interest outside the Unitarian and Universalist fellowships. Several liberal groups and independent churches are watching its operations with a view to cooperation.

Finally, the Commissions have gone on record with this broad and striking statement:

> We believe that the plan for the Free Church of America provides the foundation for the final union of the forces of liberal religion in the United States and Canada.

The officials are: Louis C. Cornish, president of the American Unitarian Association; Victor A. Friend, president of the Universalist General Convention. Unitarian Commission: Raymond B. Bragg, Louis C. Cornish, Percy W. Gardner, William R. Greeley, Frederick R. Griffin, Walter R. Hunt, Charles R. Joy, John H. Lathrop, Herbert C. Parsons. Universalist Commission: Frank D. Adams, L. A. Ames, A. Ingham Bicknell, Roger F. Etz, Victor A. Friend, Robert W. Hill, W. H. Macpherson, Frederic W. Perkins, Clinton L. Scott. Executive Committee: A. Ingham Bicknell, Louis C. Cornish, Roger F. Etz, Victor A. Friend, William R. Greeley, Walter R. Hunt.

The Study Table

The World War and Germany's Collapse*

The third volume of Prince von Bülow's "Memoirs," which covers the years of 1909-1919, is in some senses most important, interesting and controversial. However, the book cannot be regarded as an historical document, although it contains excellent critical observations on the mistakes of German statesmanship as well as military leadership which brought about the downfall of the German Empire, the end of the Hohenzollern dynasty and the establishment of the German Republic.

Prince Bülow contends that although he might have made some mistakes during the twelve years (1897-1900) he had the direction of German Foreign Affairs, he did his best to defend German rights, and kept his country out of war. He resigned the Chancellorship of Germany in 1909, leaving his country prosperous, powerful and influential, having guided the German state successfully through a period of unusual difficulty. This has been the verdict of British, Russian, Italian as well as French press and statesmen (pages 395-410). However, all was lost due to mistakes of his successor, Bethmann-Hollweg, and his collaborators, especially von Jagow in the Foreign Office and von Flotow as German Minister at Brussels and German Ambassador at Rome. A great deal of the responsibility for the downfall of Germany, he contends, must also be placed on the shoulders of Kaiser Wilhelm II, who often declared himself to be a ruler by *divine right,* was vain as well as weak, and did not wish to have men of knowledge and power as his advisors. The Kaiser's advisors, lest they might displease His Majesty by unpleasant news, neglected to keep him informed of the seriousness of conditions, until the collapse came. In the final analysis, Prince Bülow had to acknowledge that Prince Bismarck, the founder of the German Empire, with his unfailing loyality to the house of Hohenzollern and his junker tradition and love for personal government, was responsible for a constitution which endowed the Emperor with extraordinary powers, which was a source of great danger to the safety of the Empire. *Owing to limitations imposed by the constitution of Imperial Germany, men like Bismarck and Bulow, after their retirement, did not have any opportunity of influencing the policy of the State, because these statesmen were personally disliked by the Emperor.*

Bethmann-Hollweg was not a statesman and had no training in diplomacy. Prince Bülow, at the time of his retirement, warned his successor to be careful in regard to Anglo-German relations and not to antagonize Russia. He made it clear that Anglo-German rivalry had its roots in German commercial expansion, political power and naval programs. Britain would not seek a war against Germany, but if ever Germany got into a conflict with Russia aided by France, Britain would not remain neutral but support Germany's enemies to eliminate this strongest of her rivals. Therefore, according to Prince Bülow, the key to Anglo-German friendship was in maintaining friendly relations with Russia. Prince Bülow was also convinced that so long as Germany did not stand in the way of Russian aspirations in the Balkans towards Constantinople, Russia would not move against Germany. To him it was also clear that a Russo-German conflict would only arise if Austria and Russia, to fulfil their ambitions in the Balkans, came to blows and Germany failed to avert such a calamity. He further pointed out that while Germany should support Austria, in case of an unprovoked Russian attack, German statesmen should

*Memoirs of Prince von Bülow, Vol. III, published by Little, Brown & Co., Boston. 1932. Price $5.00.

keep a close watch over Austrian policy and check all aggressive tendency in the Balkans, because such a policy would certainly antagonize Russia and alienate Italy, not a negligible partner of the Triple Alliance. Prince Bülow was convinced that the spirit of revenge against Germany was deep-rooted in France and that she would, with the support of Russia and England, try to reduce German power; and mere concessions to France on colonial questions would not change French foreign policy towards Germany.

Prince Bülow found that his successor under-estimated British opposition to German economic, political and naval power and took polite expressions of friendship by British statesmen as absolute guarantees of British neutrality in case of any conflict between Germany and any other Power. Prince Lichnowsky, the German Ambassador to Great Britain, was also to blame for not being able to keep his government fully informed about the real attitude of Britain towards Germany. Bethmann-Holweg took it for granted that a liberal and democratic Britain would never support the "barbarous Russia" of the Tsars against civilized Germany. Furthermore, he felt that by making concessions to France on the Morocco question, he would be able to cement friendly understanding between France and Germany. Lastly, Bethmann-Holweg, von Jagow, von Flotow, as well as the Kaiser, became unduly influenced by the Austrian foreign policy. skilfully conducted by Count Berchtold, which ultimately led to the World War. Here is the most significant point of view of a German statesman which upsets calculations of historians who place the primary cause of the World War on the shoulders of Russian diplomats and militarists and their allies. One is inclined to think that, according to Prince von Bülow, Austrian policy, unchecked by Germany, was more responsible for the World War than any other factor.

It is a historical fact that the French and British governments had some secret understanding with Belgium regarding military aid to be extended to the latter against Germany. However, as early as 1910 German diplomacy, by pursuing a *"policy of energetic pressure on Belgium for reasons of international policy,"* made a serious blunder which strengthened Belgian hostility towards Germany. Herr von Flotow, as German Minister to Brussels, "was forever approaching the French and British ministers, and seemed to consider it possible to make Belgium and her colonies another Poland; that is to say, a country to be divided up between Germany, England and France." This policy was pursued even into the early part of 1914, but did not receive favorable response from France (pages 89-93).

Prince Bülow held that Germany should have done all that was possible to check any conflict in the Balkans, and that the Balkan War (which was a forerunner to the World War) could have been avoided by an active and more far-sighted diplomacy of Vienna and Berlin. He wrote:

> Just as, in 1866, Napoleon III based his tactics on the presumed superiority of the Austrians over Prussia, until it needed a Sadowa to dispel the last of his illusions, so too, on the eve of this Balkan War, Austria founded her attitude on the quite erroneous hypothesis of an easy victory of the Turks. This blindness, both of Berlin and Vienna, prevented any forceful intervention before the declaration of hostilities. The Turks were led to believe that nothing would be enough to alter the status quo. They were even egged on to fight, till their defeat showed all the error of these reckonings and also, alas, that the policy of the Triple Entente had been superior to that of the Central Powers as the arms of the Balkan peoples to Turkish organization and strategy. . . . A cold douche turned on Sofia would have been quite enough to stay King Ferdinand, a cautious and a never aggressive monarch. A firmer tone in Constantinople would have forced the Turks to make the new necessary concessions. But we did nothing at all, neither in Belgrade nor yet in Athens; above all nothing in Sofia, and the Turks were rather encouraged than discouraged. (Pages 126-127.)

The net result of the Balkan War was the strengthening of Serbia and Roumania, which were opposed to the Austrian policy of expansion in the Balkans. It weakened Turkey and led to Turko-Italian conflict. Prince Bülow held that with the assertion of French supremacy in Morocco, Italian statesmen were determined to strengthen Italy's position in North Africa; and after the defeat of Turkey in the Balkan War, they declared war against Turkey and annexed Tripoli. This did not aid Germany. As early as 1912, Prince Bülow was afraid of a World War. He wrote:

> I feared that, to gain lost ground in the Balkans, sacrificed by its own follies, the Hapsburg monarchy might be tempted to make use of the Pomeranian grenadier. My fears above all amounted to this; that the Emperor, should temptation present itself, led by his own romantic generosity, the clumsy stupidity of Bethmann and snobbish predilections of Jagow for feudal Austria, might get us involved in war with Russia and so with all the rest of the world. (Pages 128-129.)

Many German historians think that, after the assassination of the Arch-Duke Franz Ferdinand and Russian support of Serbia, the war was inevitable. Prince Bülow makes it abundantly clear that the war could have been avoided if Germany had used pressure on Austria to prevent her from declaring war on Serbia. Unfortunately, however, German statesmen at the helm of the state gave Austria *carte blanche* (p. 183) and even thought seriously that an Austro-Serbian conflict could be localized (p. 176), as Great Britain would never support Serbia and Russia. According to Prince Bülow, Germany, instead of supporting the Austrian ultimatum and war-like policy, ought to have insisted upon a peaceful solution of the crisis by arbitration. Furthermore, Prince Bülow held that Germany, at any event, should not have declared war on Russia. If there was to be a Russo-German war, Germany should have waited for a Russian attack. Even after the order of mobilization of the Russian army, Germany should not have declared war against Russia. But Bethmann-Holweg, thoroughly anti-Russian, hastily took the wrong step of a declaration of war, feeling that war was inevitable and a war against Russia would receive support from German Socialists (p. 187). It is needless to emphasize the point that Bethmann-Holweg's attitude regarding the violation of Belgian neutrality, and his statement, comparing a treaty to a "scrap of paper," hurt Germany most seriously. The most amazing and naive attitude of the German Foreign Office was that, in spite of the German declaration of war against Russia, France, and Belgium, Britain would remain neutral! Bülow points out that the German Foreign Office, as well as the German High Command, were under the illusion that the war would last only a short time and took no precaution to secure sufficient food-supply from abroad. Bülow is very frank to point out that, although German soldiers and officers fought very bravely, both Generals von Moltke and Falkenhyn, as the Chiefs of the General Staff, proved to be inferior leaders and committed serious mistakes.

There has been much adverse criticism regarding

the Italian attitude towards Austria and Germany after the outbreak of the World War. According to Prince Bülow, the Triple Alliance was a defense alliance and Italy was not bound to help Austria or Germany when these nations declared war on Serbia and Russia. Furthermore, both Austrian and German statesmen were criminally negligent in ignoring Italy and not consulting and satisfying her before the declaration of war. Italy, as early as 1913, made it clear that it was not to her interest to have Serbia crushed, unless Austria made sufficient compensations to Italy. Prince Bülow knew that by cession of Trentino to Italy and by making Trieste a free port, the Central Powers could have purchased Italian neutrality, which might have helped them to win the war. Prince Bülow's special mission to Rome—to keep Italy neutral—failed because of base intrigue against Bülow in both Berlin and Vienna foreign offices, which regarded Italian demands as mere bluff. The Allied Powers catered to Italian national interest and Italian statesmen supported Italy's entry to the war against Austria, which hastened the collapse of Austria and Germany. Similarly, by mishandling, Roumania was allowed to join the enemies of the Central Powers. Lastly, in 1916-1917, Russia was ready to make a separate peace, but Bethmann-Holweg destroyed such a possibility by his policy of creation of an "independent Poland" which, according to Prince Bülow, was the greatest mistake of German diplomacy during the World War. If, after the Russian Revolution, the German army had not been scattered in the Eastern front, but concentrated in the West, this might have resulted in a victory. It was a mistake for Germany not to use her navy in attacking the British fleet at the outbreak of the war. It was a pity that Germany was vacillating in regard to the use of submarines to blockade England. This was due to political as well as military miscalculations of German leaders. Bethmann-Holweg hoped, even in 1915, that after the conclusion of the war, Germany, through the good offices of Britain, would be able to bring about an Anglo-French-German understanding against Russia.

German internal affairs were grossly mismanaged, due to weakness and lack of foresight on the part of Bethmann-Holweg and the Kaiser. At the very outbreak of the World War, the Kaiser should have worked for the formation of a National Government composed of all parties, especially Socialists. The German Government ought to have inaugurated electoral reforms in Prussia, to satisfy the masses. Ignoring the Socialists and the Parliamentary majority, the German government created that opposition which later on brought about revolution. After the fall of Bethmann-Holweg, the Kaiser should have chosen some experienced and strong man to direct the German state; but the choice of Michaelis and Hertling as chancellors was disastrous and stupid, and the choice of Prince Max of Baden as unfortunate. Though Kaiser Wilhelm II always posed to be as great a military genius and strong ruler as Frederick the Great, from the outbreak of the war till his ignoble flight to Holland, he never showed any sign of strength and leadership.

Prince Bülow thought that by his flight to Holland William II betrayed the past and the spirit of glorious Prussia (p. 333). "Well-intentioned people have done their best to absolve the Emperor of his flight and saddle others with the burden of it. Such excuses will not bear examination." (p. 331.) "At the worst, William II could have died, sword in hand, on the steps of his throne" (p. 322). Just before his flight to Holland, the Kaiser wrote the following letter to the Crown Prince:

My Dear Boy:

The F. M. can no longer assure me that I am safe here, and refuses to guarantee the loyalty of troops. I have therefore, after a hard inner struggle, decided to leave the army, which has gone to bits. Berlin is completely lost, in the hands of the Socialists, and already two rival governments have been formed there, one by Ebert, who is made Chancellor, the other by the Independents. I advise you to stick to your post till the armies retreat into Germany, and prevent the dislocation of the troops. We shall meet again, by God's will! General von Marschall will tell you more.

Your deeply afflicted father,
(signed) William.

After quoting this letter Prince Bülow gives expression to his feelings in the following way:

No one except William II could have stated so badly, so naturally, with so candid an absence of all embarrassment, his true reasons for running into Holland—or rather his own neurasthenic feeling of the dangers his imagination suggested to him. Such terrors were to him far more a reality than any dread of the verdict of history, than any thoughts of glorious tradition of his house, his father or grandfather, of the Great King or the Great Elector. . . . (p. 331.)

Prince Bülow thought that a German revolution might have been avoided, but Prince Max was not equal to the task. He condemned the Allied Powers for the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, but he was severe to Germans, especially to Erzberger, for the attitude of "peace at any price" which encouraged the French to impose the most severe terms of the Treaty of Versailles. Prince Bülow did not find qualities of statesmanship among the ministers who took office after the German Revolution. They were inexperienced. However, he found in the late Foreign Ministry Herr Gustav Stresseman, a statesman of promise who was working for the regeneration of the Fatherland. As a German patriot, Prince Bülow felt that, in spite of her defeat Germany, in course of time, would reassert her position as a great world power.

Unless one reads this volume carefully, he cannot really understand the reasons behind the almost universal adverse criticism of Prince von Bülow's "Memoirs" by German politicians of all schools, especially by those belonging to the German aristocracy and the Nationalist Party. Prince Bülow in this volume, while glorifying the good qualities of the German people and hoping for the future greatness of Germany, has laid bare innumerable instances of German weakness and official intrigues against him. It is quite human that one may in secret recognize his mistakes, but be bound to feel resentment, if his weak spots and mistakes are laid bare before the whole world. Prince Bülow has done this; and this hurts the pride of a section of the German ruling class and the Kaiser who mismanaged German external as well as internal affairs and acted not with a sense of patriotism but with narrow selfishness. Sensitive Germans feel that Prince Bülow has blackened the fair name of Germany by exposing incidents which might be taken in unfavorable light. One may not agree with all the conclusions of this eminent statesman; but none interested in World Politics can afford to miss reading this immensely interesting volume, containing frank statements of one of the greatest statesmen of the world on numerous problems of international relations of which he had intimate and direct knowledge.

TARAKNATH DAS.

Baden-Baden, Germany.

An Appeal for Reform

Here is a book* that fairly bristles with scintilating commonsense. Under such prosaic chapter-headings as "Faith," "Country," "The Job and Justice," "Home" and "Self-respect" the author, an attorney of outstanding ability, makes bold to express his fundamental convictions. He has the audacity to analyze our national confusion of thought, bewildered action and make-shift programs. He challenges the political hypocrisies, economic injustices, legal fictions and religious dogma which retard progress, and then points the way to security.

The book is unusual alike in its style and contents. One gets the impression as one reads page after page that the author has come to pay one a social visit, and then in the course of that visit proceeds to express his opinions and convictions on the most important questions of the hour. The book has about it that "chatty" atmosphere which one finds where friends can foregather and trust one another. Consequently there is nothing of the staid lecture of pedant dogmatism about it. Moreover, the author sets out to prove no particular theory, nor does he assume the doctrinaire role. He is simply one of the great common men of earth speaking in truth and in charity his most profound convictions which he has formulated from wide reading, extensive research and diligent reflection. And just to that extent does the book possess genuine merit. It is red hot from the mind and soul of a justice-inflamed soul.

Indeed, the book is born out of an ethical sensitiveness, combined with a remarkable penetrating social vision, as witness his plea for capitalism to become service conscious. In the main he urges the abolition of the private monopoly of natural resources; the restriction of inheritance beyond a small amount for the immediate dependents of such an amount as is necessary for an adequate living; and the right of society to determine and then control the existence of such corporations as shall be of wholesome benefit to the whole of society.

Perhaps his plan to draft capital, just as we draft men in time of war, to meet an emergency, is as effective an argument as we have seen for some time. He closes with these trenchant words:

> When we of the great majority, are convinced that these things shall be done, we will do them with ease, directness and dispatch, not by foolish revolutions, but through ordinary legislative action, as simply as one raises the shade of a darkened room and opens the window, to let in God's sunshine and air. Then, his eternal laws, unimpeded by man's devices, will work out a just distribution of health, wealth and happiness for his creatures, without being called upon to invent any new economic schemes, legal fictions, governmental isms or social theories.

W. Waldemar W. Argow.

*Respectfully Submitted, Harold G. Aron, Georgic Press, New York, $2.00.

Peace Material for Adult Study*

It is becoming increasingly evident that formal education is not enough. That education is a life-long process is now generally recognized. Clubs, classes, and forums in large numbers flourish throughout the country. But, unfortunately, too many of these groups are content with addresses that are more entertaining than informative. Moreover, there is too much readiness to take on second-hand information, and not enough willingness to study, analyze, criticize, and evaluate.

Adults who want to study the history of international matters will find much of real interest in Benjamin F. Trueblood's "Development of the Peace Idea," in which series of papers is traced the growth of the peace idea from ancient single minds to the modern conception of universal amity held by ever increasing numbers. Denys P. Myers "World Disarmament" is a well-documented treatment of the problems and prospects of disarmament, with various valuable appendices, including the draft convention of December 9, 1930. The "Hand Book of the League of Nations Since 1920," edited by Mr. Myers, also furnishes dependable source material. "The World Court," by Manley O. Hudson, contains a brief but authoritative history of the World court, together with digests and instruments relating to it. "The Pacific Area," by George H. Blakeslee, presents, among other valuable material, an excellent summary of Sino-Japanese relations.

Curtis W. Reese.

*Development of the Peace Idea, by Benjamin F. Trueblood. Plimpton Press, Norwood, Mass. 243 pp.
World Disarmament, by Denys P. Myers. World Peace Foundation, Boston, Mass. 370 pp. $2.50.
Handbook of the League of Nations Since 1920, by Denys P. Myers. World Peace Foundation, Boston, Mass. 320 pp. $2.50.
The World Court, by Manley O. Hudson. World Peace Foundation, Boston, Mass. 245 pp. $2.50.
The Pacific Area, by George H. Blakeslee. World Peace Foundation, Boston, Mass. 224 pp. $2.00.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 290)

Oscar Cooley, Executive Secretary, Co-operative League of America.

Sinclair Lewis; Oswald Garrison Villard, Editor, the *Nation;* Stuart Chase; B. W. Huebsch; Bruce Bliven, Editor, *New Republic;* Freda Kirchwey, the *Nation;* Upton Sinclair; Claire and Paul Sifton; Edmund Wilson; Devere Allen and Kirby Page, Editors of the *World Tomorrow;* Vida D. Scudder; F. J. Schlink, Consumers Research; Sara Bernheim, Labor Bureau, Inc.; Carl Brannin, Editor, *The Vanguard,* Seattle, Wash.; Frederick Vanderbilt Field; Walter Frank; Elisabeth Gilman; Arthur Garfield Hays; Evelyn Preston; Mrs. John F. Moors; George Soule; Harry W. Laidler, League for Industrial Democracy; Mrs. Elizabeth Glendower Evans.

Bishop Francis J. McConnell; Rabbi Stephen S. Wise; Dr. John Haynes Holmes; Professors William Adams Brown, Reinhold Niebuhr, Harry F. Ward, Charles C. Webber, Union Theological Seminary; Bishop Paul Jones, Antioch College; Rabbi Edward L. Israel; Sherwood Eddy; Francis A. Henson, National Religion and Labor Foundation; Prof. Jerome Davis, Yale Divinity School; J. B. Matthews and Rev. John Nevin Sayre, Secretaries, Fellowship of Reconciliation; Rev. William B. Spofford, Church League for Industrial Democracy; James M. Myers, Federal Council of Churches.

Statement

The above urgently appeal to all friends of workers' education to come to the aid of Brookwood Labor College. Brookwood must raise not less than $10,000 in the next two months if this outstanding educational project is to carry on through this, its twelfth school year.

Food for the mentally and spiritually starved American workers is at least as necessary in this crisis as food for the physically starved. Appeals are constantly being made for generous contributions to social agencies which are engaged in "character building" or "faith restoring" activities. We submit that no activity can be more important than that of a labor college giving to workers themselves the vision of a new world and some comprehension of the means by which it may be achieved.

If American workers are to remain as ignorant of fundamental, political, economic and social questions as they now are, if they, who suffer from present economic ills, are not to be fired with the vision of a new order and the courage to build it, the result must be catastrophe.

Workers' education in this country has been altogether too weak and too

inadequately financed, even in "prosperous" times. Now, faced with a rapidly growing interest on the part of workers and a desperate need, the few enterprises we have in this field will be crippled, if not destroyed, unless swift measures are taken.

Brookwood has since its founding in 1921 made an outstanding contribution. In every section of the country its graduates are giving creditable, in some instances noteworthy, service to labor, progressive and radical movements—in unions, labor colleges, cooperatives, labor political organizations, unemployed leagues. It has given inspiration and help, has been a rallying center, for other workers' education enterprises, such as summer schools and local labor colleges and classes. The members of its staff have written books and pamphlets which are used throughout the workers' education movement. The need for more such material is keenly felt.

Through extension classes and lecture services the school reaches each year thousands of workers who cannot take a residential course.

Brookwood now faces a formidable task in raising the budget required to enable it to keep its doors open for this year. The size of the student body has been reduced, although more applications have been received than in any previous year. Drastic cuts have been made in the budget. Students and faculty are prepared to make still further cuts to the absolute limit, if the minimum required to keep the enterprise going can but be raised. Brookwood graduates organized into the Brookwood Fellowship, although all of them workers and many of them for months unemployed or nearly so, put forth mighty efforts for the success of a bazaar which was given at the Irving Plaza, New York, in December.

For the most part, however, workers' organizations cannot give now, though in the past they have contributed to Brookwood sums aggregating many thousand dollars. We therefore call upon all friends of education, all who believe in the crucial importance of developing an effective and intelligent labor movement in this country, to respond—immediately, enthusiastically, generously—to Brookwood's present appeal for funds. Small gifts as well as large are welcome. The job can be done, we believe, if all who are concerned will give what they can.

The Prophets Speak!

Declaration
Central Conference American Rabbis

From many angles, present-day capitalism is under grim suspicion as to its ability ever to achieve a satisfactory sense of social responsibility. It has, in effect, placed the safeguarding of investments above the safeguarding of human life. With a few conspicuous exceptions, it has fought labor's right to organize and to have a decent voice in the administration of the basic pursuit of a livelihood. It has, in some instances, exploited the masses by reducing wages or eliminating employment in cases where such action was not at all justified on the basis of the financial status of an industry. It has steadfastly sought to speak of the return of prosperity on the basis of a return to private profits rather than a concern with how the great masses of men are going to be able to achieve even a minimum living wage. During the days of outward prosperity it was oblivious to the demands of a living wage, when, despite the enormous inflation, the average incomes of the families of our land were below what even our government regarded as minimum for decent livelihood.

Any system which can be so characterized is neither economically sound nor can it be morally sanctioned. We therefore advocate immediate legislative action in the direction of changes whereby social control will place the instruments of production and distribution, as well as the system of profits, increasingly within the powers of society as a whole. We feel by this means alone can there be achieved an adequate distribution of worldly goods and an introduction of a system whereby the working hours in a machine age can be so adjusted in terms of time and pay as to make us feel that we are following our ancient prophetic mandate concerning man's stewardship of the earth for the benefit of all humanity.

We call attention to the fact that, whereas the pulpit is willing to assist in any and all appeals for the charity of relief, this does not sum up our usefulness or our significance in the present crisis. There has been a tendency among those who profit by the *status quo* to regard, particularly today, the pulpit's function to be to raise charity funds to patch up social ills, while keeping silent concerning the wounds which fester underneath the patches. We are ready to assist in all humanitarian charitable projects that may be immediately necessary, but we assert that the more permanent function of religious groups is to evoke a social conscience concerning the administration of our economic life whereby, through social and economic reconstruction, the periodic pauperizing of masses of human beings through charity and relief will become unnecessary.

An Outstanding Collection!

SOCIAL HYMNS

Prepared under the direction of The Survey Associates

This hymnal has had more influence on present day hymnology than any other single source. It contains 110 Hymns of Brotherhood, Peace and Social Awakening. *With Music.*

Price—*Cloth,* 50 cents, *Paper,* 25 cents

A. S. Barnes and Company

(Hymn Book Publishers Since 1858)

67 West 44th St. New York

BEGINNING THE THIRD VOLUME OF

The New Humanist

The January-February issue contains

A RELIGIOUS MOOD
by **James H. Hart**

THE FUNCTION OF A RADICAL CHURCH
by **Curtis W. Reese**

PHILOSOPHY AND CIVILIZATION
by **Oliver L. Reiser**

HOW MODERN IS DR. FOSDICK?
by **Harold P. Marley**

INTELLIGENCE AND RELIGIOUS LIBERALISM
by **Ernest Caldecott**

Max C. Otto says:

"If ever there was a time in greater need of Scientific Humanism in its ethical, political, educational, religious applications, I do not know of it. And **The New Humanist** seems to me to be making a clean, clear contribution to that need."

Back this effort in critical and ultra-free journalism with your subscription.

Per Copy 20c Annually $1.00

THE NEW HUMANIST

105 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

Help India's struggle for freedom by non-violence! Help us offset British propaganda and meet Gandhi's request for moral support from America.

Join the American League for India's Freedom, John Haynes Holmes, chairman.

Tear off and return:

American League for India's Freedom
383 Bible House
New York City

Count me in as a supporter of India's struggle for independence. Here are my membership dues $.....

Name .....

Date .....Address.....